



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,608	05/31/2001	David E. Cox	5577-130DV	9481

20792 7590 09/22/2005

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/870,608	Applicant(s) COX ET AL.	
	Examiner Djenane M. Bayard	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Ne

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 6/24/05 in which claims 15-37 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15, 20 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues that Cheng fails to teach "including a segment configured to initiate registration operations for the application program at the target station in the file packet". A new prior art is introduced to teach this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15, 20, 22 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,206 to Dean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,713 to Shrader et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,904,719 to Andersson.

- a. As per claims 15, 20 and 22, Dean et al teaches a method for distribution of application programs to a target station on a network comprising the steps executed on a centralized network management server coupled to the network of: providing an application program to be distributed to the network management server (See col. 2, lines 50-67); preparing a file packet

Art Unit: 2141

associated with the application program (See col. 5, lines 25-40); and distributing the file packet to the target station (see col. 2, lines 50-67). However, Dean et al fails to teach specifying a source directory and a target directory for distribution of the application program and including a segment configured to initiate registration operations for the application program at the target station in the file packet.

Shrader et al teaches an installation plan object for installing applications in a network. Furthermore, Shrader et al teaches specifying a source directory and a target directory for distribution of the application program (See col. 2, lines 59-67) col. 17 lines 45-61).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate specifying a source directory and a target directory for distribution of the application program as taught by Shrader et al in order to determine if the file directories and files objects are valid and accessible on the network (See col. 2, lines 61-62).

Andersson et al teaches and including a segment configured to initiate registration operations for the application program at the target stationing the file packet (See col. 8, lines 3-14).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate and including a segment configured to initiate registration operations for the application program at the target station as taught by Andersson et al in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in order to ensure that only users who are authorized by the provider can obtain updates for software products (See page 4, paragraph [0051]).

b. As per claim 32, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Cheng et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Dean et al teaches wherein distributing the file packet is preceded by executing a pre-distribution program at the network management server (See col. 8, lines 40-60)

c. As per claim 33, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Cheng et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Dean et al teaches method wherein executing a pre-distribution program includes determining an environment for the application program that exists on the target on-demand server (See col. 8, lines 12-20).

5. Claims 16-17, 24-25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,206 to Dean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,713 to Shrader et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 69,047,194 to Andersson as applied above to claim 15, 20 and 22 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,012 to Jarriel.

a. As per claims 16, 24 and 28, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Cheng et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al fails to wherein the network management server is a Tivoli. server.

Jarriel teaches wherein the network management server is a Tivoli server (See col. 1, lines 12-35).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the network management server is a Tivoli ser as taught by

Art Unit: 2141

Jarriel in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in order to permit remote site management and operation (See col. 1, lines 12-35).

6. Claims 15, 20, 22 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,206 to Dean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,713 to Shrader et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 69,047,194 to Andersson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,012 to Jarriel as applied above to claim 16 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0110241 to Cheng et al.

a. As per claim 34, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Andersson teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in view of Andersson fails to teach wherein preparing a file packet includes including a selected version of an application launcher in the file packet, the selected version being selected based on the determined environment.

Cheng et al teaches wherein preparing a file packet includes including a selected version of an application launcher in the file packet, the selected version being selected based on the determined environment (See page 4, paragraph [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein preparing a file packet includes including a selected version of an application launcher in the file packet, the selected version being selected based on the determined environment as taught by Cheng et al in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view

Art Unit: 2141

of Shrader et al in view of Andersson in order to download relevant update for the software product (See page 4, paragraph [0053]).

b. As per claim 35, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Andersson teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al fails to teach wherein distributing the file packet is followed by executing an after-distribution program at the target on-demand server.

Cheng et al teaches wherein distributing the file packet is followed by executing an after-distribution program at the target on-demand server (See page 4, paragraph [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein distributing the file packet is followed by executing an after-distribution program at the target on-demand server as taught by Cheng et al in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in order to download relevant update for the software product (See page 4, paragraph [0053]).

c. As per claim 36, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Andersson teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Anderson fails to teach wherein registration operations include maintaining at the target on-demand server a profile management list identifying application programs available for use by the user and wherein the method further comprises updating the profile management list at the target on-demand server to make the application program available for use by the user.

Cheng et al teaches wherein registration operations include maintaining at the target on-demand server a profile management list identifying application programs available for use by the user and wherein the method further comprises updating the profile management list at the target on-demand server to make the application program available for use by the user (See page 4, paragraph [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein registration operations include maintaining at the target on-demand server a profile management list identifying application programs available for use by the user and wherein the method further comprises updating the profile management list at the target on-demand server to make the application program available for use by the user as taught by Cheng et al in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in view of Anderson in order to download relevant update for the software product (See page 4, paragraph [0053]).

d. As per claim 37, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al and further in view of Anderson teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Dean et al in view of Shrader et al fails to teach wherein the profile management list includes a designation of authorized users for application programs identified in the profile management list.

Cheng et al teaches wherein the profile management list includes a designation of authorized users for application programs identified in the profile management list (See page 4, paragraph [0054]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the profile management list includes a designation of authorized users for application programs identified in the profile management list as taught by Cheng et al in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in order to download relevant update for the software product (See page 4, paragraph [0053]).

7. Claims 18-19, 26-27 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,206 to Dean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,713 to Shrader et al further in view of U.S. Patent 6,047,194 to Andersson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,012 to Jarriel as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498 to Baker et al.

a. As per claims 18, 26 and 30, Dean et al in view of Shrader in view of Andersson teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Dean et al teaches wherein the segment configured to initiate registration operations includes a variable field into which the target station inserts its identification during registration operations (See col. 8, lines 1-12 and figures 18 and 19). However, Dean et al fails to teach wherein the application program is registered based on a Universal Resource Locator (URL) address accessible to a browser application and wherein the segment configured to initiate registration operations includes a variable field into which the target station inserts its identification during registration operations.

Art Unit: 2141

Baker et al teaches wherein the application program is registered based on a Universal Resource Locator (URL) address accessible to a browser application and wherein the segment configured to initiate registration operations includes a variable field into which the target station inserts its identification during registration operations (See col. 14, lines 22-41).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate wherein the application program is registered based on a Universal Resource Locator (URL) address accessible to a browser application and wherein the segment configured to initiate identification during registration operations as taught by Baker et al in the claimed invention of Dean et al in view of Shrader et al in order to simplify the enterprise burden by limiting the client development side to screen layouts and data presentation tools that use a common interface enabled by the web browser (See col. 2, lines 50-57).

b. As per claim 19, 26 and 31, Dean et al teaches distributing comprises the step of distributing the file packet to a plurality of target stations each having an identification which may be inserted into the variable field at the target station (See col. 8, lines 1-12 and figures 18 and 19).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

Art Unit: 2141

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER